



The major event of the 20th century

The loss of faith by the Catholic hierarchy

Paolo Pasqualucci

Until very recently, more or less educated people generally considered the major event of the 20th century to be the Russian Revolution, with its consequent worldwide expansion of communism.

But after the fall of the Berlin Wall (1989) and the self-imposed dissolution of the Soviet Union, Marxism and its practical implementation were forgotten overnight.

So what other event? Could there be one more important than the revolutions, the two World Wars, the genocides, the landing of man on the moon and other terrible and extraordinary events and phenomena of the century that has just ended?

For us, there is an event of extreme gravity, capable of arousing the just wrath of God towards the world: the loss of the Faith by a large part of the Catholic hierarchy, which emerged from the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council (1962–1965). Naturally, we refer to the Faith as it results from the official documents of the current *Magisterium*.

The sign of this loss of Faith is the praise of the world, the enemy of Christ.

How could the world, by definition “the kingdom of the prince of this world”, become so enthusiastic about an Ecumenical Council that was supposed to *ex officio* condemn its errors and repeat the doctrine and morals professed by the Church for nineteen centuries?

The songs of victory for the “spirit of openness” addressed to the values professed by contemporary man never cease, a spirit of openness manifested by Vatican II, which replaced condemnations with mercy, anathemas with understanding, the conversion of souls to Christ with the search for “dialogue”: it thus replaced dialogue with error with the traditional dialogue with the errant for the salvation of his soul.

This world never tires of repeating, in unison with the current Hierarchy, that the Council represented (finally) the “aggiornamento” of the Holy Church to the secular values that it had always rejected in the past: from science to progress, from freedom of conscience to human dignity, to universal fraternity, to the collective search for earthly happiness.

But if the children of the Century praise the Council of those whom Our Lord called to convert them through preaching and example, and if the children of the Century praise it precisely because they decided to go to meet the “religion of man” (Paul VI), in short, if they praise it for the anthropocentric inversion that occurred in an apparently improvised way in official Catholicism, this means that this Council was not a good thing and that the darkness of the Century penetrated it.

Proof: Doctrinal change

The updating of the Church's doctrine to the reality of our time, they say, has not been capable of attacking the "deposit of faith", that is, the dogmas taught since the beginning of time.

This is the official thesis: "aggiornamento", yes; "doctrinal change", no. In any case, it is a necessary thesis.

The Holy Church – which is of faith – has always enjoyed the assistance of the Holy Spirit with regard to the dogma of faith and the rule of morals.

Changing, even partially, the doctrine taught up until now (about faith and morals) would allow the obvious and unacceptable conclusion that the Holy Spirit, in the past, was mistaken (and with the Holy Spirit the Martyrs, the Saints, the Popes) or did not assist the Holy Church!

That is why there can be no novelty on this point and if, unfortunately, there were some, it would be an error that should be rectified as quickly as possible for the Glory of God and the salvation of souls.

There is a whole literature on the doctrinal changes introduced or promoted by Vatican II, little known to the general public, but which is no less valid; an anticipation, if we may say so, of the positions taken by many among the Fathers of the Council, of the minority faithful to the dogma.

One need only think of the Roman Catholic intellectual Amerio, who died a few years ago, an illustrious expert on Campanella and the ethical thought of Manzoni, and the author of a masterful analysis – translated into French, English and Spanish – on the multiple deviations of the post-conciliar period, caused at the root (this is Amerio's well-documented thesis) by the ambiguous "innovations" introduced by the Council, some of which smack of heresy (1).

Amerio and other researchers have highlighted the ambiguities and double meanings present in the conciliar documents, which mix propositions faithful to the dogma with others that alter it and sometimes contradict it.

And this ambiguity, already present in the teaching of John XXIII, has remained like a poisonous film on the post-conciliar magisterium to this day.

A brief excerpt from the conciliar errors and ambiguities

1) In the constitution *Lumen Gentium*, which deals with the proper notion of Church, an erroneous definition of the Church clearly appears, because it states, in article 8, that the “Church of Christ” subsists in the Catholic Church and that the “Church of Christ” also includes “elements of sanctification” and “truths external to the Catholic Church”.

For nineteen centuries it has been taught that the Catholic Church is the one and only true Church of Christ, because it was founded by Him and constitutes His Mystical Body, the sole depository of Revealed Truth, in continuity with the teaching received from Him and transmitted by Saint Peter and the apostles to their successors and to the Fathers of the Church, kept “from hand to hand” (Council of Trent) until today.

Those who separated from this were rightly considered schismatics (sects and not churches) and, furthermore, heretics if they professed doctrines contrary to the deposit of faith (such as Lutherans, Anglicans, etc.). Christian communities that have separated from the Church cannot, as such, grant salvation to their members: having separated from the one true Church, they are deprived of the help of the Holy Spirit, without which the salvation of the soul is not possible. And all other religions can do even less. Not having been founded by the Son of God (whom they do not want to acknowledge), they cannot teach the Truth that has been revealed to us about the divine Mysteries and about customs.

This is how the Holy Church has always taught. Does she say, by any chance, that anyone who is not Catholic is a priori condemned to eternal punishment? No, because it has always taught that we can be saved by baptism of desire: explicit, when the one who asks for baptism, even though he is outside the Church, already lives striving to do God's will, but dies before receiving baptism; implicit, when, without fault of his own, outside the true faith, the non-Catholic nevertheless lives trying to do God's will in everything, so as not to die in a state of mortal sin: he is saved in his religion but not through his religion (2).

Vatican II contradicts this doctrine when it inserts into the Church of Christ, alongside the Catholic Church, "elements of sanctification and truth" or even of salvation, represented by the other Christian denominations as such, with their false doctrines, already formally condemned by the *Magisterium*.

Sects are thus improperly elevated to the level of "Churches": this is expressly stated in article 3 of the conciliar decree *Unitatis Redintegratio* on ecumenism. This is a manifest theological error to which is also added a logical error in the following article 4, where it is said that only the Catholic Church maintains "all the plenitude of the means of salvation" (and therefore no longer uniqueness) while the "Churches" of Protestants and schismatics, as such constituting "means of salvation" used by the Holy Spirit (!), show "deficiencies".

Since salvation is evidently always the same (heaven), it is not clear by what logic the "means of salvation" of Protestants and schismatics, afflicted by "deficiencies" and therefore deficient, can by themselves grant the same salvation as that offered by the means of salvation of the Catholic Church, means that do not suffer from these "deficiencies".

Heretics and schismatics would then be part of the "Church of Christ": that is why they are not asked to return to the one true Church after having renounced their errors.

In fact, the decree *Unitatis Redintegratio* does not speak of “return” but of “conversion” in a completely abnormal sense: “unity must not be achieved by the return of those separated to the Catholic Church, but rather by the conversion of all the Churches into the whole Christ, who does not subsist in any of them but is reintegrated through the convergence of all into One” (3).

A false notion of the “Church of Christ” is therefore the basis of the “ecumenical dialogue” with the so-called “separated brothers”.

The unity to which this “dialogue” aspires is therefore false, necessarily aberrant, even on the logical plane, since it must make truth and error live together: the immutable revealed Truth entrusted to the Church with the delusions of free individual examination, of the “simul iustus et peccator” and other similar things; the necessity of meritorious works for salvation with their denial; the indissoluble “divinitus” marriage with the very soluble one of the Protestants and Orthodox, etc.

2) Lumen Gentium was subsequently marked by an erroneous conception of episcopal collegiality.

In fact, the supreme potestas iurisdictionis over the Church, which is granted by divine right to the Pope, was also attributed (by Article 22) to the college of bishops in union with the Pope, something never before admitted.

We therefore have two holders of supreme power (a true legal absurdity) with the only difference being that the bishops do not exercise it without the authorization of the Pope.

In essence, this compromise formula leaves the episcopal conferences practically free to exercise the broad autonomy and competences that were recognized to them ex novo by the Council (decree *Christus Dominus*, Article 37), especially in liturgical matters, to experiment and adapt rites to local cultures (constitution *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, Articles 22, 39, 40).

The Holy See's control over the behavior of bishops has essentially been reduced to noting the initiatives of the Episcopal Conferences, now that the "*potestas*" with which the bishops are collegially invested is "supreme" like that of the Pope.

The Episcopal Conferences have thus pulverized the authority of each bishop (individually).

The authority of the Pope and the authority of the bishop have suffered a dramatic decline, giving precedence to the authority of the collective of bishops, who even enjoy legislative powers.

The hierarchical constitution of the Church has been subverted by the establishment of an episcopal oligarchy.

In addition, *Lumen Gentium* brought another modification (article 9 et seq.) to the notion of the Church, conceived not as the "mystical body of Christ" (Saint Paul) but as the "people of God".

Now it is the community of the faithful, presided over by priests, that becomes the Church, as if the latter were to be constituted essentially from below, in the assemblies that constitute the local Church, the sum of which constitutes the Universal Church.

Thus the part is taken for the whole – the "people of God" for the totality of the Church – with the aim of introducing a democratic vision, close to the way of feeling of heretical Protestants, totally alien to Tradition, which, evidently, has always remained firm on the origin and supernatural nature of the Holy Church, manifested and guaranteed by its hierarchical organization.

3) On the other hand, the constitution *Gaudium et Spes*, which deals with the relationship between the Church (the "Church of Christ" e.g. article 8 of *Lumen Gentium*) and the contemporary world, clearly suffers from a diffuse anthropocentrism, totally incompatible with sound doctrine.

Article 3 states that the “aim of the Church...is to save man, to build up humanity... consequently... the Council, proclaiming the eminent greatness of man's vocation... offers humanity the sincere cooperation of the Church, with a view to establishing that universal brotherhood which corresponds to this vocation”.

Note well: there is no thought of “saving man” the sinner through conversion to Christ, the only one who makes eternal life possible for him (Mk 16:15-16; Mt 28:18-20).

No. This Hierarchy thinks of achieving “salvation” by committing to the establishment of an earthly and worldly “universal brotherhood,” which has nothing to do with the supernatural purpose proper to the Church.

It is the brotherhood of secular ideologies that have rotted over time, from which *Gaudium et Spes* does not hesitate to extract other seeds: “the victories of humanity [and what would they be?] are a sign of God’s greatness and the fruit of his ineffable plan” (article 34); “earthly progress... is of great importance for the Kingdom of God” (article 39), etc.

This exaltation of man finds impressive accents in article 22: “Christ...also fully reveals man to himself and manifests to him his most high calling.” It seems that Our Lord did not come to save sinners who would believe in Him and be converted (“I did not come to call the righteous, but sinners” Mark 2:17) but to make men aware of this great thing that He, man, is, in order to exalt man!

The highest vocation of man would result from statements such as the following: “that man is the only creature that God wanted for himself” (art. 24 cit.) while “with the Incarnation the Son of God united himself in a certain way with every man” (art. 22 cit.)

That is why men “all, redeemed by Christ, enjoy the same vocation and divine destiny” (art. 29).

Here are spread the seeds of a doctrine that had never before been taught by the Church (because God made all things for “Himself”, for His glory and nothing “for Her”, not even man) (4), and that this doctrine would have, as is known, its development in the post-Council period: that Our Lord, with the Incarnation, would be, in a certain sense, united with every man, so that it could be considered – by this single fact – that all men would already be redeemed, without the need for their conversion or their return to Catholicism.

And it is with this very false premise (a real trap for its supporters) that “dialogue” with other religions was established, in order to be able to establish a planetary unity with them, a syncretism no less monstrous than that sought with heretics and schismatics.

4) The Council should then have repeated the usual doctrine on the two sources of Revelation (Sacred Scripture and Tradition), on the absolute inerrancy of Scripture, on the full and total historicity of the Gospels.

But in the constitution *Dei Verbum* on divine revelation, these fundamental principles are first set forth in an ambiguous manner (in the much-disputed articles 9, 11, 19), with expressions that, in one case (in article 11) lend themselves to entirely opposite interpretations, one of which reduces inerrancy to merely “the truth enshrined in Scripture for our salvation.”

This amounts in practice to heresy, because it calls into question the absolute character of the inerrancy of the Holy Scriptures.

5) The Council then implemented the liturgical reform, the sad effects of which have been visible to all for years.

The ancient and venerable Catholic liturgy of the Holy Mass, the heart of Catholicism, has disappeared, replaced by a new rite, in the vernacular, which Protestants have been able to declare theologically acceptable!

In fact, its *Institutio* (1969 and 1970) does not mention either the dogma of Transubstantiation or the propitiatory character of the Sacrifice (thanks to which our sins are forgiven), which also constitutes a dogma of faith (Denz. Schönrm 938/1739-1741; 950/1753).

On the contrary, the accent is placed, in the Protestant manner, not on the Sacrifice of the Lord but on the banquet which is his memorial or rather the memorial of the Resurrection (Paschal mystery) more than of the Cross, offered to the assembly of the faithful under the presidency of the Priest, an assembly which now concelebrates on the same plane as the latter.

In this Mass, the supernatural aspect of the true Catholic Mass, the unbloody repetition of the Sacrifice of the Holy Cross through the transubstantiation of the bread and wine into the body and blood of the Lord, has disappeared, knowing that the *Institutio* limits itself to mentioning an undifferentiated, unqualified and unqualifying “real presence”, because it considers in the same way the assembly of the faithful, the person of the minister, the word of Christ and the Eucharistic species. (5)

The latest studies have categorically highlighted why the new rite cannot in any way be defined as Catholic.

In fact, “everything that could have a relationship with the punishment due for sin, as well as the propitiatory purpose of the Mass, has been removed from the Rite of the Mass.”

Furthermore, according to the heterodox theology of the “Paschal Mystery”, which considers the memorial rite capable, in itself, of making present, outside of human time, the mysteries of the death and resurrection of Christ, the liturgical reform profoundly modified the ritual structure of the Mass to the point of eliminating its precisely sacrificial dimension (6).

This was also made possible by the use of a very particular notion of symbol, of esoteric appearance – in our view – that recalls the dark and fallacious doctrines of René Guénon and Co.

Since the theology of the Paschal Mystery considers the Eucharist no longer as a visible sacrifice but as a symbol that makes mysteriously present the death and resurrection of the Lord and that allows, through these facts, contact with the glorious Christ, the presence of Christ the Priest and Victim gave way, in the liturgical action, to that of the Kyrios who communicates himself to the assembly (7).

And such an improper, almost magical notion of symbol contributed to the development of a new notion of Sacrament, naturally different from that which belongs to the deposit of faith (8).

Well, this incredible Mass of the Novus Ordo was already anticipated in articles 7, 10, 47, 48, 106 of the conciliar constitution *Sacrosanctum Concilium* on liturgical reform, which, furthermore, in articles 21, 24, 37, 38, 40, 90, 119, also considers the simplification of the rite, to make it easier, more adapted (!) to the secular, national and local culture; an update to be achieved through creativity and liturgical experiments.

All these novelties expressly go against all the teachings of the Church.

This gave rise to the diverse and multiple rites that dominate today, from the Afro-Catholic (which is displayed with dances and drums inside St. Peter's Basilica in Rome), to the Indian-Catholic, to the national and local variants and to the personal rites of the different officiants of service.

The orthodoxy and majesty of the Ancient Roman Rite, whose canon dates back to the Apostles, was succeeded by the Babylon of the new rite submissive to acculturation, the fruit of a perverse doctrine.

6) Vatican II showed that it accepted the lay concept of freedom as "*libertas a coactione* – freedom from coercion", ontologically founded on the dignity of man as man, to justify the licit character of any religious cult (conciliar declaration *Dignitatis humanæ*, articles 2, 3, 4).

The Council thus justifies freedom understood as the absolute self-determination of the individual, of an individual who considers himself fulfilled and self-sufficient, while the Church has always taught that freedom cannot be separated from the (revealed) Truth and that the dignity of the person is obscured if he lacks the rectitude of the will that seeks the Good, because this dignity is founded on supernatural values and not on man as man (9).

And the Council, consequently, introduced the idea of the free search for truth by the individual conscience, with its own natural powers, alone and in union with men of good will of all beliefs and of every faith (*Gaudium et Spes*, 16), which is less Catholic than one might imagine.

This position led, finally, to the affirmation of a substantial independence of the “political community” in relation to the Church: both would have in common the only fact that they are “at the service” of a general “personal and social vocation among men”, so as to be able to carry out “healthy collaboration according to the modalities adapted to the circumstances of place and time” (*Gaudium et Spes*, 76) or even according to the criteria of simple opportunity.

But this is contrary to the constant teaching of the Church, according to which the Church has primacy over the “political community” and the latter, even in its relative independence, must contribute to the salvation of souls through the realization and defense of a common good inspired by Catholic values.

We should continue and stop, for example, at the unrealistic analyses of the contemporary world contained in *Gaudium et Spes*, dressed up with the worst clichés, taken from the secular ideologies current then and now, or at the sugarcoated and untrue image of non-Christian religions, presented in article 16 of *Lumen Gentium* and by the conciliar declaration *Nostra Ætate*.

But what we have said so far seems sufficient to us.

Despite the punishment, hope.

From these brief visions, rigorously based on texts, it is understood that something similar to what astonished Giuseppe Prezzolini happened, to justify (despite being a layman) the condemnation inflicted by Saint Pius X in 1908 on the modernist heresy [which wanted, precisely, to adapt the faith to the modern world, that is to say, to science, philosophy, democracy, progress, universal brotherhood, sentiment and individual freedom, national cultures, etc., removing from it, in fact, every supernatural element]:

“The desires of the modernists would logically have led to the destruction of Catholicism and its transformation into a vague and general religiosity and, ultimately, into a poor copy of socialism.”

Despite the condemnation, the modernist heresy remained hidden, waiting for “better times,” which began to appear in the 1920s and 1930s with the New Theology, especially in Germany and France.

This New Theology took up and developed the errors of modernism, and was subsequently able to penetrate widely into the texts of the Council, despite the censures and condemnations (although moderate) of Pius XII, which were evidently shared by some sectors, both of the high and low clergy (but more of the high clergy).

This was possible because Vatican II wanted to declare itself to be a simple pastoral council, which did not intend to define either dogmas or errors. (Note read “in class” on November 16, 1964), thus renouncing in an unusual way the charism of infallibility, intrinsic to the extraordinary *magisterium* of an authentic ecumenical council. (The juridical nature of Vatican II was then left undetermined).

This singular “*capitis diminutio* – reduction of authority” on his part has the consequence that the criticism of the novelties introduced by this Council does not contradict the dogma of infallibility that the Council neither required nor proclaimed.

The punishment was not long in coming.

The churches, convents, and seminaries were emptied.

Priests and nuns seem to be an endangered species and those who still exist seem, in large numbers, to be possessed by a protest mentality, inclined to rebellion and social demands, more to politics than to the care of souls.

Catholic unity has been – in fact – dissolved into national and continental “churches” governed by their respective Episcopal Conferences.

The Catholic world is living in a climate of substantial anarchy, against which the Holy See has always shown itself powerless. (and it will not be able to begin to remedy it, in our opinion, until the obstacles that the Holy See itself has illegitimately placed against the free celebration of the true Mass of the ancient Roman Rite, the true Catholic Mass, declared perpetually valid by Saint Pius V and never abrogated by anyone, and which therefore has never ceased to be celebrated legitimately, even if only by a small minority, since 1969, the year of the introduction of the Novus Ordo, are removed.)

Catholicism no longer attracts anyone, its prestige has never been so low, while Catholics are apostasizing in ever greater numbers.

The Catholic nations are gripped by the most advanced religious indifferentism and by a frightening moral and civil dissolution, the seeds of which pre-existed due to the materialism and atheism spread in different but complementary ways by the two dominant models, Americanism and communism.

Then, in the last two decades, a murderous migration of peoples, mainly Muslims, began to descend upon Catholic nations, as well as upon the rest of the “West.”

The whole earth seems corrupt (Gen. 6:11).

Our Lord, the Son of God, consubstantial with the Father, instituted his Church for the salvation of the world: "Go... and make disciples of all nations..." (Matt. 28:19).

If the faith of the majority of pastors, unfortunately, is corrupted, who will convert the world, who will save it? Should we then despair of the future? No, because Our Lord said that "the gates of hell shall not prevail" against the Holy Church (Matthew 16:18).

We hope, therefore, God willing, that from the beginning of the 21st century, the hierarchy will begin to tear away the veil of false doctrines that has long covered its face, that it will finally hear the cry of souls immersed in darkness, that it will once again preach the dogma of faith and present itself once again to its flock with all the boldness of faith.

We hope that all peoples will begin to shake off, by the grace of God, the hedonism, materialism, mental emptiness and spiritual nullity that are currently destroying them, so that they may rediscover the conviction of their mission.

It is not politics but religion that is everything!

It is necessary to take into account that the reign of politics is over and that peoples, as well as individuals, must do the will of God, of the true One and Triune God. The rest does not count.

Let us dare to hope that Catholic nations will once again recognize as their duty to "establish all things in Christ": the restoration of Catholicism as a doctrine and way of life, for our salvation and for the salvation of the world, so that one day it may be fully recognized in a Pope who dares, finally, to raise high the banner of the Faith.